

REMARKS:

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 13 and 17-20 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. It is noted that claim 20 was cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer in the Amendment filed on April 9, 2008.

By this Amendment, claims 13 and 17-19 have been amended and new claim 21 is added. No new matter has been presented. Claims 1-12, 14-16 and 20 remain cancelled. Thus, claims 13, 17-19 and 21 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

*** **

REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW:

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience to conduct an Interview in order to expedite the prosecution of this application.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §112:

On page 2 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 13, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. By this Amendment, claims 13, 17, and 18 have been amended and no longer include the language in the form rejected by the Examiner.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

On page 3 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 13, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,308,164 (Nummelin) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,557,515 (Abbruzzese), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,610, (Gundewar). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of the remaining claims.

Claim 13 recites, "retrieving repudiation reasons of elements of previously reviewed tasks among said elements stored that match elements forming a current task to be electronically authorized and a user requesting authorization of said current task" Applicants respectfully submit that Nummelin does not teach or suggest these features of claim 13.

Instead, Nummelin is limited to obtaining status information of a particular task to monitor and report project progress of that particular task (see, col. 5, lines 32-42). On page 3 of the

outstanding Office Action, the Examiner asserts that it is obvious that the task status would be derived from the elements stored in a database. However, the status data stored in Nummelin merely refers to information specific to a task such as when the task was started, the progress of the task toward completion and when the task was completed (see, col. 6, lines 37-43).

There is nothing in Nummelin that implicitly or explicitly teaches any kind of association of a task with a previous review of another task including retrieving information of previously reviewed tasks "that match elements forming a current task to be electronically authorized", as recited in claim 13.

In fact, Nummelin teaches away from maintaining information across tasks because the asserted purpose of Nummelin is to maintain information of each task to facilitate planning and scheduling of that specific task.

Nummelin does not teach or suggest comparing "elements forming completed tasks" with "elements of a task submitted for review" and identifying an element as "a check point" when there is a match based on the comparison. See claims 17, 18 and 19 reciting similar features.

Instead, as mentioned above, Nummelin is directed to reporting project progress of each individual project or task.

Starting on page 3 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the diary function in Abbruzzese is equivalent to displaying repudiated reasons of elements. However, the alerts in Abbruzzese are only reminders for items corresponding to a current case that need processing and a table with a field for reason (see, col. 65, lines 29-67). Thus, Abbruzzese does not teach or suggest "displaying said retrieved repudiation reasons of said elements of said previously reviewed tasks and retrieved repudiation reasons for the user in association with said elements of the current task to be electronically authorized", as recited in claim 13 for example.

As mentioned above, the independent claims patentably distinguish over Nummelin, and Abbruzzese. Further, as Gundewar merely refers to a table indicating "Perform Checkpoint Review" as a process associated with the major project tasks (see, col. 5, line 14 through col. 6, line 4), Gundewar does not cure the deficiencies of Nummelin, and Abbruzzese regarding the independent claims of the present application.

Gundewar does not teach or suggest "of said elements forming the current task to be electronically authorized, an element matching at least one of said elements of the previously reviewed tasks is designated as a check point", as recited in claim 13. Gundewar is silent

regarding designating "a check point" of review on one task based on repudiation reasons of other previously reviewed tasks.

Claim 13 recites a check point based on "a number of said retrieved repudiation reasons of the elements of the previously reviewed tasks in comparison to a number of authorizations of said element for the task and the user, and an accumulated number of repudiation reasons totaling a number for each repudiation reason within a designated term is displayed as the check point."

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest determining "check point" for review of "a current task" based on a result of "previously reviewed tasks" of the user and an accumulated number of repudiation reasons "totaling a number for each repudiation reason within a designated term is displayed as the check point."

Further, even assuming *arguendo* that the references did disclose the features discussed by the Examiner, the Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine the cited references. In particular, the record, however, fails to provide the required evidence of a motivation for a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform such modification. While Abbruzzese discusses a diary function that records specified date of a current claim, Nummelin fails to suggest why a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to incorporate the diary function such as discussed in Abbruzzese in a system that validates fields defined by the system as data is input into the fields. Therefore, as there is no requisite motivation to combine the references cited by the Examiner, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's §103 rejections.

According to MPEP 2143.01, the modification proposed in the Office Action cannot render the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. *In re Gordon*, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Assuming, *arguendo*, that the teachings of the cited references could be combined, the combination would result in a system for validating data being input into fields at resource workstations and a diary function for setting reminders. It is not possible for the scheduling system to validate data as the data is being entered into fields in Nummelin and setting a diary function to be subsequently reminded of items that need processing, as asserted in Abbruzzese.

Even if the references were combined, the claimed invention is patentably distinguishable over the cited references for the above-mentioned reasons.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

The cited references do not teach or suggest an element "among said elements displayed is designated as a check point for review based on a number of said retrieved repudiation reasons for the task and the user, and an accumulated number of cases of repudiation reasons within a designated term is displayed as the check point", as recited in claim 21. Instead, as mentioned above, Nummelin obtains status information of a particular task to monitor its progress, Gundewar merely refers to a table indicating "Perform Checkpoint Review" as a process associated with the major project tasks, and the alerts in Abbruzzese are only reminders for items corresponding to a current case.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that new claim 21 is also patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT:

Applicants respectfully request entry of amendments to the claims because the amendments were made to clarify features recited in the claims and do not introduce significant changes that would require a further search.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11/25/2008

By: Temnit Afework
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 25, 20 08
STAAS & HALSEY
By: Temnit Afework
Date: 11/25/08